

I. The Office Action's Assertions

The Office Action asserts that JAIC and Gipson disclose that Scotch Branch tapes may have acrylic adhesive. The Office Action further asserts that Database discloses that Scotch Brand tapes may have acrylic adhesive with a thickness of 20 μm . Thus, the Office Action asserts that the Scotch Branch tapes used in Bonzo possess all features listed in Table 1 of the present application.

The Office Action acknowledges that the Examiner does not have the means to measure the adhesive force of the Scotch Brand tapes used in Bonzo in accordance with JIS Z0237. However, the Office Action asserts that the materials and thicknesses are similar to those of the adhesive film listed in Table 1. Therefore, the Office Action asserts that it is reasonable to conclude that the tapes used in Bonzo have an adhesive force similar to that of Example 2 listed in Table 1. Accordingly, the Office Action concludes that the tapes used in Bonzo have an adhesive force within the range recited in the claims.

II. The Argument Presented in the July 10, 2006 Amendment

Applicant respectfully submits that Bonzo does not disclose or suggest the features listed in Table 1 of the present application.

As asserted in the July 10 Amendment, Bonzo discloses a film thickness of 0.025 millimeters. See col. 8, line 13. Bonzo does not disclose or suggest whether this "thickness" is the thickness of an adhesive layer or the total thickness of the film including the substrate layer. Thus, Bonzo does not disclose or suggest the features listed in Table 1 of the present application, because Table 1 of the present application lists three examples, each with a total thickness significantly greater than 0.025 millimeters.

As asserted in the July 10 Amendment, there is no logical connection between the disclosure of Bonzo with the features disclosed in JAIC, Gipson and Database, because

Bonzo does not specify whether Bonzo's "thickness" is the thickness of the adhesive layer or the total thickness of the film, as discussed above, and thus does not specify a particular product disclosed in JAIC, Gipson and Database. Thus, Bonzo does not disclose the features listed in Table 1 of the present application, regardless whether JAIC, Gipson or Database may appear to disclose certain features listed in Table 1 of the present application.

Also, Bonzo does not inherently disclose whether Bonzo's "thickness" is the thickness of the adhesive layer or the total thickness of the film, because Bonzo's "thickness" could have several possibilities, and does not necessarily correspond to either the thickness of the adhesive layer or the total thickness of the film.

In view of the above, Bonzo does not disclose or suggest the thickness characteristics listed in Table 1 of the present application. Thus, even if the acrylic adhesive material disclosed in Bonzo is "an acrylic polymer adhesive" as asserted in the Office Action, such an acrylic polymer adhesive is too general a term for one of ordinary skill to identify a specific material of the adhesive layer used by Bonzo. There are many kinds of acrylic adhesive materials, and each of them has different adhesive force. Thus, a mere general term "acrylic polymer adhesive" does not provide the specifics of an adhesive force.

III. Additional Arguments

Bonzo only discloses "a polyester film such as Scotch Brand Magic Transparent Tape" (see col. 8, lines 12-14). Such a "polyester film" does not inherently disclose or suggest the film that comprises a substrate layer and an adhesive layer and that has an adhesive force of 3-15 N/25 mm, as recited in claim 8.

In particular, there are various kinds of "Scotch Tape" which consist of substrate layers made by polyester, polystyrene, polyimide, polyvinyl chloride, nylon etc., respectively, and adhesive layers made by acrylic adhesive, rubber adhesive, silicone adhesive etc., respectively. For example, according to the printouts from www.3M.com/industrial (see the

enclosed Information Disclosure Statement), Scotch 3M Transparent Film Tape 681 has a backing made of 3M Paklon film, and an adhesive made of pressure sensitive rubber resin; Scotch 3M Transparent Film Tape 605 has a backing made of polypropylene film, and an adhesive made of pressure sensitive acrylic; Scotch 3M Transparent High Tack Film Tape 622 has a backing made of 3M Scotchpar film, and an adhesive made of pressure sensitive rubber resin; 3M High Temperature Nylon Tape has a backing made of nylon, and an adhesive made of rubber; and 3M Water-Soluble Wave Solder Tape 5414 has a backing made of PVA film, and an adhesive made of water soluble synthetic. Thus, Bonzo's "polyester film" does not inherently disclose acrylic as described in the specification at Table 1.

The Office Action asserts that JAIC and Gipson discloses that Scotch tapes may have an acrylic. However, as listed above, Scotch tapes have a plurality of possible adhesives. JAIC and Gipson discloses only one possible type of Scotch tape. It is not obvious to one of ordinary skill to attempt to obtain the claimed adhesive force by using this one possible Scotch tape in view of the disclosure of Bonzo.

Furthermore, a Scotch tape having a polyester substrate and an acrylic adhesive may have a substrate thickness and an acrylic thickness that are different from those described in Table 1 of the specification of the present application. For example, as shown in the printouts from www.mmm.co.jp/tape-adh (see the enclosed Information Disclosure Statement), 3M tape model no. 9391 has a total thickness of 22 μm , which corresponds to Bonzo's film thickness of 25 μm (see Bonzo at col. 8, line 13). However, the substrate thickness of 16 μm and the acrylic layer thickness of 6 μm of Model No. 9391 are different from those described in Table 1 of the present application. Thus, even if Bonzo arguably discloses a polyester film having a polyester substrate and an acrylic adhesive layer, Bonzo does not inherently disclose the claimed adhesive force, because the adhesive force of 3M tape model no. 9391 has an adhesive force of 2.15N/cm, which only equivalent to 5.375N/25 mm.

The Office Action asserts that Database discloses substrate thickness and adhesive layer thickness that are comparable to those disclosed in Fig. 1 of the present application. However, Database only discloses a few possible substrate thicknesses and adhesive layer thicknesses out of the variety of possible substrate thicknesses and adhesive layer thicknesses. It is not obvious to one of ordinary skill to obtain the claimed adhesive force from the thicknesses shown in Database in view of Bonzo's disclosure.

Additionally, a Scotch tape having a substrate and an adhesive layer with thicknesses and materials similar to those described in Table 1 of the present application does not necessarily process the claimed adhesive force. For example, as shown in the printouts from www.mmm.co.jp/tape-adh (see the enclosed Information Disclosure Statement), 3M tape model no. 9390 has a polyester substrate with a thickness of 25 μm , and an acrylic adhesive layer with a thickness of 25 μm . The thicknesses and materials are similar to those of Example 2 listed in Table 1 of the present application. However, the adhesive force of 3M tape model no. 9390 is 3.92 N/CM, which only equivalent to 9.8 N/25mm. This adhesive force is much less than the 12.26 N/25 mm of Example 2 listed in Table 1 of the present application. Thus, it is not obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to obtain the claimed adhesive force from the teachings of Bonzo and Database.

In view of the above, the scattered teachings in Bonzo, JAIC, Gipson and Database do not disclose or suggest the adhesive force, as recited in the claims. One of ordinary skill would not have been motivated to select the samples in JAIC, Gipson and Database to combine with Bonzo to obtain the claimed adhesive force.

IV. Conclusion

For at least the above reasons, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 8-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of claims 8-19 are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff
Registration No. 27,075

Gang Luo
Registration No. 50,559

JAO:GXL/tls

Attachments:
Information Disclosure Statement
Request for Continued Examination

Date: December 29, 2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--